

REMARKS

Claims 4-35 and 38-60 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 36 and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 58-60 have been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6 and 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schlossberg et al (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0066034). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As to claim 4, the Examiner states that the configuration in claim 4 is disclosed in Schlossberg at paragraph 0014, 0075-0078, with reference to Fig. 9, num. 905.

Applicants' submit that claim 4 of the present invention describes "means for generating an image visualizing into respective objects", "a user using said devices", a user using said devices", "a device operating in said external network", and "communication conducted between each device inside and outside of said LAN". In contrast, paragraph 0076 and Fig. 9 of Schlossberg describes visualizing or indicating only intruder activities as 'blips' 915 while objects corresponding to "a user using said devices" and "communication conducted between each device inside and outside of said LAN" are not indicted. Therefore, Applicants invention as described in claim 4, displays objects differently from that disclosed in Schlossberg.

Additionally, Applicants' note that claim 4 of the present invention involves three objects, "a user using said devise", "a devise operating in said external network", and

“communication conducted between each device inside and outside of said LAN”, are visualized and displayed simultaneously in a screen, and thus, an operator can find the situation inside and outside the LAN. On the other hand, according to Schlossberg, an operator can find only the intruder activities. Therefore, it is seen that the configuration according to Applicants’ claim 4 is not described in Schlossberg.

In addition to the foregoing, claims 5 and 6 should now be allowable. Applicants note that Schlossberg does not describe dividing into groups said objects according to a predetermined standard and visualizing each group in layers. Further, the predetermined standard for grouping is based on reliability between each device and LAN which is not recited or contemplated by Schlossberg.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 7-35 and 41-57 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have essentially amended the claims to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, all claims currently pending should now be in condition for allowance.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and

favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 11, 2006

By: 
Robert M. Siminski
Reg. No. 36,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RMS/jao